

THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.—Office : Servants of India Society's Home, Poona (D. G.).

VOL. XI, No. 10. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1928.

{ INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN SUBSN. 10s. 6d..

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	121
ARTICLES :—	
The Indian Budget	124
Education in Bihar and Orissa	125
Studies in Recent Turkish History—I. By Raghu Nath Row	126
Treaties and Political Practice.—II. Alwar. By Prof. G. R. Abhyankar, B.A., LL.B.	127
OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER	129
REVIEW SECTION :—	
National Character. By Dr. Nares C. Sen-Gupta, M.A., D.L.	130
The New China. By Rev. Fr. H. V. Elwin, B.A.	132
Hobson on Industrialism. By Principal D. R. Gadgil	131
Sun Yat Sen's Policy. By N. G. Chapekar, B.A., LL.B.	133
Are the Irish a Riddle? By J. T. Donovan, I.C.S.	135
SHORT NOTICES	135
BOOKS RECEIVED	136

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

MR. GEORGE LANSBURY finds it hard to understand all this pother of boycott and *hartal*. Perfect Equality, but— The Indian Committee, according to him, is just a counterpart of the British Commission "equal in numbers, status and powers to our own. . . . It is just as good as if the original Commission had been composed of fourteen members one-half of whom would be appointed by India herself." It cannot be denied that the British Government have maintained a strict parity between the two Commissions. The British Commission will hear in common with the Indian Commission a very large proportion of the witnesses who will offer evidence, and if it will hear a few witnesses separately so can the Indian Commission itself do. And if it so prefers, the Indian Commission, in order to revenge itself, may hear twice the number of witnesses all by itself, shutting out the British Commission from these hearings. The two Commissions will again sit together to assess the evidence; and if in the end the British Commission will submit to its Parliament a report stating the effect the evidence has produced on *its* mind, appending thereto a report of the Indian Commission, so may the Indian Commission do too. It may submit to its Parliament its own report, and again, if they are minded to score off the British Commission, refuse to include the latter's report as an annexure either. With the British Parliament the reports

of the two Commissions will take equal rank, thus ensuring that the Indian Commission's report will not suffer by reason of its being printed as an appendix to the British Commission's report. If there is still any doubt on the point, why, the Indian Parliament has in its own hands the remedy for redressing any inequality on this score by giving correspondingly less weight in its own consideration to the British Commission's report, or even by refusing to take this report into its consideration at all. Thus not only is the Indian Commission everywhere level with the British, but is in a position of distinct advantage, and yet the Indians complain of want of equality, Mr. Lansbury cannot understand why.

YES, there is equality between the two Commissions and Mr. Lansbury's reasoning would be unanswerable if the Indian and the British Parliaments also were co-equals, the Indian Parliament having the right to punish Britain with a backward political constitution because the British Parliament enacts a like one for India. But the two Parliaments do not stand on an equal footing. Only the other day (Feb. 20) *The Times* wrote: "The authors and supporters of Saturday's resolution (of Lala Lajpat Rai in the Assembly) apparently assume that the question has already been settled that the Indian Parliament, as far as India is concerned, is in fact the equal of the British Parliament. That, of course, is true neither in law nor in fact, but it is just as well that this fundamental issue is stated so sharply at the beginning of the Commission's work." Indians realise this quite well, and just because they realise it so well that they are not impressed by the apparent equality of the two Commissions. The British Commission hearing their own witnesses and writing their own report and presenting it to their own Parliament on the one hand and the Indian Commission hearing their witnesses and writing their report and presenting it to their Parliament on the other would be a perfectly equitable arrangement if the Indian Parliament, like the British, could enact binding laws in respect of India's constitution, but the Indian Parliament occupying as it does a subordinate position, there is no compensation in the British Commission being subjected to the same disabilities to which the Indian Commission is being subjected. As it is, as the *New Statesman* has very bluntly but quite rightly put it, the Simon Report, "quite irrespective of maintenance or breakdown of boycott, is likely to remain for a very long time as the authoritative document by which the future British Governments, whether Conservative, Liberal or Labour, will be guided in their dealings with India." It is the Simon Report alone that will weigh with Parliament and not the annexure of the Indian Report. It is just because of realisation of this fact and of the further fact that the Indian Parliament cannot be quits with

the British Parliament by just refusing to consider the Simon Report because the British Parliament refuse to consider the Indian Report that Indians decline to co-operate with Sir John Simon and his colleagues in a necessarily subordinate capacity.

MR. LANSBURY further makes out that the Indian Commission would have a decided advantage over the British Commission inasmuch as the former can go over the Simon Report with the Joint Parliamentary Committee as the British Commission cannot do. This point is really answered by the quotation given above from the *New Statesman*, which makes it clear that whatever the theoretical position may be, practically the Simon Report will be for Parliament a decisive document. Of course Mr. Lansbury has a different conception of the Simon Commission, which is "not to accept or reject, but in the main merely to report. Its functions are neither legislative nor administrative. Its duty will be to tell the British Parliament what it is the Indian people desire as the next stage, or if you like, the final stage of India's development towards self-government." If the Commission is merely to report and not to negotiate, as some Labour members hoped would be the case, India can surely leave the Commission well alone, negotiating, if she is so minded, with the proper authorities at the right time. No harm can possibly result from the boycott of the Commission, if India, instead of placing her scheme of Swaraj before Parliament through the Simon Seven, does it directly and immediately. Thus, boiled down, the case for the boycott amounts to this: if the Commission are mere reporters carrying no authority, boycott cannot be injurious; if on the other hand their recommendations will be regarded as authoritative, Indians must refuse to co-operate with them unless they can take an effective share in formulating these recommendations. Boycott is therefore either merely innocuous or absolutely imperative. In any case it is justified. We for our part think India's national self-respect requires it, however dire may be the consequences.

LORD SINHA'S sudden death at Berhampore in Bengal on Monday last deprives this land of one of its foremost citizens. During his life he attained to exceptional distinction, being the first Indian to be Standing Counsel and later Advocate-General to the Bengal Government, to be a member of the Government of India, to represent India at the Imperial War Conference and, last but not least, to enter the British Cabinet as Under-Secretary of State for India. It was his appointment to that position which earned for that Cabinet the appellation of a 'White and Black Cabinet' at the hands of some Tory die-hards. As Under-Secretary he proved a capable help-mate to the late Mr. Montagu in piloting the Government of India Bill 1919 through the House of Lords. When the Reforms were introduced, it fell to his lot to work them in Bihar and Orissa as Governor. During his brief regime in Bihar, it is an open secret that he submitted a liberal minute to the Repressive Laws Committee, pressing for the removal of most of the repressive laws from the statute book. His association with the National Congress was only when he presided over its session in Bombay in 1915, his appeal to the British Government from whose presidential chair for a clear statement of their policy towards this country being reported to have largely paved the way for the declaration of responsible government as the goal of British policy in India made in Parliament about twenty months later. It is also significant that the Congress under his leadership should have opened

its doors to the extremists who had seceded from at Surat. Owing to his retirement from public life for more than six years he was out of touch with active political life, as his views about the attitude Indian should adopt to the Simon Commission clearly showed. With all that none can doubt that his death is a great national loss.

LAST week's Bombay Development debate initiated by Mr. Swaminarayan in the Bombay "Development" Council witnessed a remarkable climb-down on the part of Government, which was in refreshing contrast to their attitude to similar motions in the past. The disclosures in the Harvey-Nariman case have apparently left them in a chastened spirit and the result was that when in the course of the debate non-officials combined in wanting to know what the Government proposed to do with regard to the official mentioned in the proceedings of the case as not having acted straightforwardly and in pressing for an inquiry into these disclosures by means of a Committee, the General Member, Hon. Sir Cowasji Jehangir, in a speech marked by much sweet reasonableness showed himself ready to meet the wishes of the Council and announced the appointment of a Committee with Mr. Nariman himself as a member. Sir Cowasji did well in giving expression to his anxiety to see everybody against whom there was even a shadow of suspicion of corruption and underhand dealing brought to justice. But what is more important is that he has proved his own bona fides and considerably facilitated the task of those who want to help the Committee with their evidence by promising full protection to them. For this he deserves praise. The Committee is also charged to recommend to Government constructive proposals with regard to the future working of the Development Department.

BABU BHAGWANDAS has recently issued a public statement giving reasons for preferring certain fundamental ideas of political science and art which are more in accord with Indian traditions as the basis of the projected Swaraj Constitution. The first idea is that the system of government should be built up in pyramid form from the village panchayat up to the King and above him the sovereign Legislature. Babu Bhagwandas does not approve of the coordinate position of the Executive and Judicial functions but would regard them as subordinate functions regulated by the Legislature. Hence the second idea is that the distinctive functions of government are (1) Education (2) Protection (3) Procuring livelihood. He says the question of 'complete independence' is solved by regarding the Legislature as the sovereign authority. We do not think the question can be so easily solved; the question is whether the Legislature in India should be really sovereign or should be dominated by the British Parliament and whether India is to determine the constitution of its Legislature or an outside authority like the British Legislature. Babu Bhagwandas doubts whether these two ideas would be accepted by any Indians considering that they are committed to schemes based on an altogether different pattern. But he thinks that the following should be acceptable even to those who have drafted constitutions on the Western models. They are as follows:—The Legislator should be wise, should have mature human knowledge of human nature and experience of one main department of national life; secondly elections for the primary panchayats should be direct but for higher panchayats right up to the sovereign Legislature indirect. Indeed Babu Bhagwandas feels, and rightly so, that it is far more difficult to

legislate wholly by Referendum and Initiative in a country with an immense population like India than by securing wise legislators. The considerations that should guide the electors in choosing such wise men are:—The age of the candidate should not be less than 35; that he represents some science or art, trade or industry, or military or executive ability; he must be honourable, broadminded and tolerant; that he has independent means and ample leisure for public work; that he does not canvass for himself directly or indirectly. All this is beautiful but the question will arise, are we to wait till the electors have such a high level of intelligence and courage, to introduce democratic institutions? For the present at least Babu Bhagwandas' ideas cannot find a practical application in a concrete scheme for Swaraj.

THE discussion on the Railway Grants was rather heated and occasionally created bad blood; but it served to bring to the forefront certain aspects of the Railway Grants. Railway management on which Indians feel very strongly. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta's motion for reduction of the grant in respect of the Board to one rupee went too far as a censure motion because if passed it would practically paralyse the work of the Railways. There was also an amount of exaggeration in his remarks; for example, when he said that the profits were illusory. With all that his motion was the signal for a series of trenchant criticisms against the Railway Board which could not possibly have been withheld. Mr. Mehta pressed for the appointment of an Indian to the Board and expressed doubts about the fulfilment of the promise about Indianisation. Mr. Iyengar criticised the policy of the Board in arranging freights so as to foster foreign industries and handicap Indian industries. In reply the Commerce Member said that if the Board is to work properly members have to qualify themselves by expert knowledge. The innuendo evidently was that no Indian had expert knowledge, which, to say the least of it, is due to sheer prejudice.

Mr. Kunzru next moved for a nominal cut in order to raise a debate on racial distinction in subordinate services. Mr. N. C. Kelkar, supporting the motion, asked whether the policy of the Board was "woe to the conquered". All that Mr. Parsons, the Financial Commissioner for Railways, could say in reply was that they had received assurances from railway administrations that racial discrimination was being abolished and that the Board had informed the Agents that Indians should be given equal opportunity for showing their aptitude. Col. Gidney had the magnanimity to admit that the Anglo-Indian monopoly must cease and maintained that the Anglo-Indians were not afraid of competition. Mr. Cocke expressed a hope that the Board would not allow themselves to be driven into a policy of Indianisation quicker than they ought to go and maintained that in certain posts Indians might not be as efficient as Europeans. Mr. Cocke's old-world fancies did not remain unchallenged. Mr. N. M. Joshi retorted that Indians had not been given a proper trial and recommended the appointment of a special officer to look into cases of racial discrimination. Mr. Jayakar described the various ways in which discrimination was patently observed and characterised Mr. Cocke's mentality as fossilized. Sir George Rainy said that Government would not take measures which would involve a sudden and violent dislocation of the existence of the Anglo-Indian community. This is hardly relevant considering that no Indian has ever put the demand in this way. Although Pandit Kunzru's motion was

lost it served the purpose of concentrating attention on a very serious grievance.

Pandit Kunzru moved another cut to protest against the lack of educational facilities for the children of the Indian employees of Railways. Sir George Rainy thought that the matter should be fully discussed by the Central Advisory Council before the Assembly came to a final decision and assured the House that the matter would be discussed with educational authorities with a view to fill up the gap caused by a withdrawal of the present grants. On the assurance of a full discussion by the Central Council the motion was withdrawn. Pandit Kunzru further raised a discussion on the Stores Purchase policy of the Railways and recommended a special branch of the Indian Stores Department where Railway experts should function. Sir Walter Willson supported the motion and testified to the success of that Department which besides had a definite policy of encouraging Indian industry. Near the end, Mr. Das drew attention to the fact that the Company-managed Railways had not fulfilled the obligation to recruit 75 p. c. Indians. Mr. N. M. Joshi finally raised a discussion about the management of 'fine funds' and about the inadequate facilities afforded to third class passengers which elicited from Sir George Rainy a promise to examine the suggestions of the Assembly. We hope that the heckling to which the Railway Board was subjected would make it more and more careful of redeeming its previous commitments.

THE Bihar and Orissa Budget for 1928-29 shares with the Bombay Budget the stigma of being a deficit Budget, the Revenue being estimated at Rs. 574 lakhs and the Expenditure at Rs. 588 lakhs. The main heads of revenue are Land Revenue estimated to yield approximately Rs. 172 lakhs, and Stamps Rs. 109 lakhs. Expenditure figures invite striking comparisons with those of Bombay. The expenditure on General Administration is Rs. 72 lakhs, whereas Bombay shows Rs. 221 lakhs under the same head. Does that mean that Bombay is an advanced province or that Bihar's is an ante-diluvian administration? Similarly, the expenditure on the Police is Rs. 84 lakhs while in Bombay we spend Rs. 170 lakhs; when it is remembered that Bihar has got about twice the population of Bombay, this means either that Bihar people are more law-abiding or that Bombay has more than its share of criminal mentality and law-breaking proclivities. Bihar is decidedly backward in Education for its size, spending only Rs. 87 lakhs as against Rs. 177 lakhs in Bombay for the same head. The same is true of Medical Relief for which Bihar intends to spend nearly Rs. 30 lakhs against Rs. 54 lakhs in the Bombay Budget. On Public Health, Bihar spends Rs. 15½ lakhs, which comes to half of the sum budgeted for in Bombay. The expenditure on Industries, Rs. 10 lakhs, is decidedly a mark of retrogression, considering the vital need of the country for industrial regeneration.

Bihar must be congratulated on having kept clear of reckless expenditure and over-ambitious schemes. A review of the new schemes and projects included in the Budget reveals remarkable caution and modesty which has saved it from a larger deficit. As however there is hardly any head of revenue likely to expand except perhaps Stamps, the Province will have to rely on Public Debt instead of on Revenue for beneficent services in future. Provided that the borrowing is kept within such limits as would make the interest charge an easy burden and that a Sinking Fund for the repayment of loans is sacredly preserved, such a policy is a clear desideratum.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

WE can all endorse the statement in Mr. Burdon's speech in the Council of State that there is nothing sensational in the Budget for 1928-29. It has no surprises in the way of reductions in taxation nor does it unfold new schemes of taxation likely to alienate the sympathies of certain classes. But in this very characterization as commonplace lies the significance of the Budget. It quietly garners the fruits of the consolidation of the finances during the last five years of Sir Basil Blackett's stewardship. The principal feature of this consolidation was the reduction of the chaotic mass of temporary and long-term debts to an ordered system in which each species of debt has a definite place and a function. The uncertainties as to the capital and interest having been removed, one can predict now with greater certainty the trend of the ordinary items of income and expenditure. It was in this wise that Sir Basil could definitely look forward to secure such a surplus this year as would enable him to wipe out the Provincial Contributions.

The balance of trade for the year 1927-28 promises to reach a higher figure than Rs. 40 crores since already we have a balance of Rs. 37.24 crores for the ten months ending 31st January 1928. We may take this as a sure indication that the period of trade depression has definitely ended. Part of the credit for this expansion of trade is given by the Finance Member to the stabilisation of the Rupee. It is a pity that the revised estimates of the yield of the income-tax show a deterioration of as much as Rs. 1.30 crores. This is however made good by the Railway contribution which exceeds the Budget figure by Rs. 88 lakhs. The Ways and Means position is perfectly sound if we can waive our objection to a large capital outlay on Railways. It is difficult to see why a Sterling loan should be issued in England, after the promises given two years ago for the substitution of internal for external borrowing. The only explanation offered is the poor response to the Rupee loan during the current year; whatever the reasons may be, the sterling loan policy ought not to be revived. We are glad to be assured that the net amount of India's external indebtedness is considerably lessened during the current year. It is an achievement that since 1923 the Finance Member has managed to reduce the unproductive debt of India by Rs. 76 crores; and we can easily believe him when he says, "if the recent rate of progress is continued our unproductive debt should vanish altogether in about twelve years' time." While we have ungrudgingly given him the full meed of praise for reducing the unproductive debt in a remarkable degree we cannot but feel anxious about the total figure of Debt which year after year is increasing. The provision for reduction of debt for the current year as well as for the next year is approximately Rs. 5.5 crores, and it is surprising to see how Sir Basil Blackett is satisfied with this figure when it is noted that the total debt to-day is little short of Rs. 1000 crores.

Coming to the estimates for 1928-29, the net Customs revenue is expected to be Rs. 50.18 in spite of the loss of Rs. 40 lakhs resulting from the abolition of the import duty on mill stores and machinery. The Income-tax is estimated to yield Rs. 17 crores, that is Rs. 1.35 crores more than the revised estimates for the current year. The contribution from Railways however will be reduced to Rs. 5.48 crores, which is Rs. 88 lakhs less than the current year's contribution. The military expenditure, instead of showing a lower figure, is actually in excess of the current year's expenditure by Rs. 18 lakhs, which is explained as being necessitated by the expansion of the Territorial Force. The Finance Member now tells us finally that the figure proposed for the next year cannot be reduced if India is to make a reasonable provision for her defence *in modern conditions*. The last words are ominous and probably suggest that new schemes for modernization may be shortly expected. The Posts and Telegraphs will continue as heretofore to work at a loss. The aggregate budgeted revenue is put at Rs. 132.23 crores and the expenditure at Rs. 129.6 crores, leaving thus a surplus of Rs. 2.63 crores.

Sir Basil Blackett was perfectly right when he described the remission of Provincial Contributions as the first claimant to this surplus. He had been working all these years for wiping out slowly but surely this charge, which kept the Provincial Governments always in a bad mood and prevented some of them from carrying out very urgent reforms in beneficent or what are called the nation-building departments. The partial remissions too have been so unevenly distributed that they have intensified provincial jealousies instead of allaying them. To remove such a bone of contention is the primary duty of a Finance Member if he can do it without injury to more vital claims on recurring surpluses. Of course, it might be maintained with some show of reason that a reduction of taxation affecting the very poor is to be preferred to an extinction of Provincial Contributions. But in this connection more weight attaches to the fact that the removal of this payment frees the provinces for ever from any interlocking of their finance with the finance of the Central Government and definitely brings us much nearer to the goal of provincial autonomy. If the question of Income-tax, which is a sore point with Bombay and Bengal, can be finally solved in a way satisfactory to all the provinces, the logical separation of the provincial finance from the central finance, which has long been a "consummation devoutly to be wished" will be realized. Sir Basil Blackett may therefore "sail away from India in a cloud of praise and glory" simply in virtue of having finally extinguished the Provincial Contributions, apart from being balked of a spectacular reduction of taxation. Of course provinces that cannot balance their Budgets will grumble even after this remission; but in any case they will be deprived of any excuses on the ground that the contribution to the Central revenues had been one of their handicaps.

This is the fifth surplus Budget presented by Sir

Basil Blackett and considering the legacy handed down to him by his predecessor, it is a marvel how soon he has reinstated his surplus Budgets in the place of the Budgets with phenomenal deficits during the aftermath of the War. So far as the part played by stability of prices in India in this financial stabilization goes, Sir Basil Blackett takes credit to himself in the statement introducing the Budget for his attempt to peg the Rupee at a higher sterling value than the pre-war value. We should regard this however as still a moot question; it is too early to pronounce a final opinion on the new ratio as the effects of the new policy can hardly be said to have exhausted themselves. In any case it will have to be conceded that even a temporary stability brought about by a control exercised over internal currency, has helped the process of general stabilization in Europe and America and to that extent has bridged the wide divergence between world-prices and Indian prices, which was a marked feature of trade conditions before Sir Basil took charge of the Indian finances. Opinions of course differ with regard to the deflation policy so zealously carried out by him during the last five or six years. But it cannot be gainsaid that it has resulted in preventing the Indian prices from keeping themselves in a world apart.

If India is justified in looking forward to bright prospects of financial well-being and to prospective reductions of taxation, as Sir Basil Blackett hopes—and we can very well share his hopes—the credit is due in a large measure to his financial genius, to his untiring patience and to his power of understanding which made him so willing to make compromises with the members of the Assembly when they were necessary for avoiding financial deadlocks.

EDUCATION IN BIHAR AND ORISSA

THE recently published third quinquennial review of education in Bihar and Orissa covering the five years ended on March 31st, 1927, shows that the period was characterised by some progress in education, though at a disappointingly slow pace. This was so particularly with regard to female education. The percentage of literacy for the province is 3.26, being 5.9 for males and .69 for females which means that not more than 7 women in 1000 are literate! The number of educational institutions for males went up from 23,407 in 1921 to 28,646 in 1927, which is however lower by 255 than in 1926. The quinquennium has seen the addition of one each to the number of arts and professional colleges for males, which now stands respectively at 10 and 5. Boys' high and middle schools have increased by 5 and 47 respectively and in 1927 numbered 135 and 563. There was an increase of over 5000 in the number of boys' primary schools, as compared with 1921; but the number for 1927 viz. 27,567 is smaller by 230 than in the preceding year. Now to turn to female education. There is one arts college for females and only 4 high and 28 middle schools for them. The number of girls' primary schools increased by 282 during the five years under review; but as in the case of boys, the number for 1927, viz. 2,790, was smaller by 177 than that for 1926.

The number of unrecognised institutions for males went down during the period by 261, while

that of those for females swelled from 24 in 1921 to 132 in 1927. The number of male scholars increased by 293,624 and stood at 994,227 in 1927; that of female scholars by 8,595 and was 71,269 in 1927. It may be added that this represents a decrease of 2,791 in the corresponding figure for 1926. 40,640 boys in 1927 as against 46,620 in 1921 were studying in unrecognised institutions and 2,358 girls as against 485 in 1921. The educational expenditure of the province rose from Rs. 11,516,347 in 1921-22 to nearly Rs. 1¾ crores in 1926-27, an increase of about Rs. 62 lakhs shared practically by all sub-heads. It will thus be seen that the province is educationally very backward, but fearfully so specially in regard to female education.

But though so backward in education, it enjoys the distinction of providing the cheapest education among Indian provinces; anyhow the average annual cost per scholar in 1924-25, viz. Rs. 10-4-7, was the lowest in India. According to the quinquennial review under notice, however, it seems to have gone up to Rs. 16-10-2; the latest corresponding figures for the different provinces not yet being available, it is difficult to say whether Bihar and Orissa will still carry the palm in regard to least expensive education; but one can safely hazard the guess that, when compared to other provinces, its per capita cost would be found to be very nearly the lowest, if not the lowest, in India. It must be a matter for wonder to many as to how Bihar can manage its education so cheaply; but the reason is not far to seek. Payments to teachers there seem to be on a very low scale, and compare unfavourably with those in force, say, in Bombay. While in Bihar the minimum prescribed for a trained teacher is Rs. 20, that for qualified teachers in Bombay has been fixed at Rs. 25, and for 1st, 2nd and 3rd year trained respectively at Rs. 30, Rs. 35 and Rs. 40. But the difference in the scales of salary in the two provinces becomes still more glaring when it is remembered that the minimum in Bihar for untrained teachers who have passed the middle standard is Rs. 8 and that for those who have passed a lower standard Rs. 5 as against Rs. 20 for unqualified teachers in Bombay. It is no wonder therefore that with such a low scale of salaries as is in force in Bihar the cost of education is lower than in any other province. But the aim ought, in our opinion, to be not so much cheap, as good, education. This of course depends largely upon the teacher, who, if he takes his calling seriously, can do a great deal to improve the quality of his instruction. But to enable him to do so, he must be paid at least a living wage. Can anybody say that the monthly pittance of Rs. 8 or Rs. 5 that is being paid to Bihar teachers provides in these days of high prices anything like a living wage? If it is desired that the quality of education in Bihar should improve, it appears to be necessary that such improvement must be preceded by an improvement in teachers' salaries.

A noteworthy feature of the system of primary education in the province is the growing demand for instruction in Sanskrit which the *pathshalas* give. Their hold on the public mind can be imagined by the fact that though during the five years covered by the review, the increase in primary schools was 17.7 per cent. and that in *maktabs*—primary schools in which instruction is given in Urdu and in the religious principles of Islam—55.9, the number of *pathshalas* went up by as much as 138.5 per cent. This demand for more *pathshalas* and *maktabs* has the effect of making the already sufficiently complicated problem of universal primary education still more complicated, as will be apparent from the following extract from the report:—"We are now reaching a stage when each village wants a primary school, a *maktab* and a

Sanskrit *pathshala*. In addition, as is mentioned later it is claimed that even at the lower primary stage separate schools are necessary for girls and in many cases separate schools for the children of the depressed classes also. Thus in the poorest province of India, we are being asked to provide five primary schools for one village. This is altogether outside the range of practical politics."

As regards compulsion, the Bihar and Orissa Government hold the view that "the time is not yet ripe for any comprehensive scheme of compulsion in rural areas." Even in urban areas it does not seem to have made much headway, for we are told that compulsory and free education is in force only in the Ranchi municipality and in three rural areas. The introduction of compulsion in three rural areas is of too recent a date for any results of its working to be available; but the experience of the Ranchi municipality, which has been working the experiment since 1921, is very encouraging. It has been ascertained in its case that, as a result of the introduction of compulsion, 2,139 boys out of its total school-age male population of 2,200 are actually at school; and the percentage of attendance is 78. We do not see why with such remarkable success attending the experiment in Ranchi, the area of its operations should not be extended and why girls, at any rate in the more advanced urban areas, should not be brought under its sway. It is to be noted that the Government contributes 66 per cent. as against 50 per cent. in Bombay, of the expense incurred on all schemes of compulsory education in municipal areas. The working of compulsion in Ranchi has brought out the important fact that boys of school age form, not 10 per cent. as was originally believed, but 12 per cent. of the total male population. The proverbial law's delays hampered somewhat the proper working of compulsion, taking in some cases more than a year for the settlement of cases. But some improvement in this matter has taken place recently, and in 1926-27 out of 635 cases instituted presumably against guardians for irregular attendance at or absence from school of their wards 623 were settled quickly.

STUDIES IN RECENT TURKISH HISTORY.

I.

THE Peace Treaty with Turkey was not signed by the Allies in 1919 simultaneously with the Treaties of Germany, Austria and Bulgaria. This was not because of any lack of thoroughness in the Allies' advantage over Turkey at the time, as by signing the Armistice of Mudros in October, 1918, the Turks had virtually placed themselves at the disposal of the Allies. The forts of the Dardanelles and Bosphorus had been surrendered, and the Turkish army had been reduced to an absolute minimum. Though the capital itself was not occupied by Allied troops until March 16, 1923, when it was done as a demonstration against the growing influence of the Nationalists, after the Armistice had been signed Allied warships had passed the Dardanelles and anchored off Constantinople. When on October 23, 1918, Turkish envoys boarded the British Admiral's flag-ship at Mudros to sue for peace "the death-knell of Turkey seemed to have actually sounded", and even the melancholy fortunes of that ill-fated Empire never perhaps stood lower.

The delay in inflicting a Treaty on Turkey was not due to any lack of premeditation on the part of the Allies, but because the consequences of the war did not quite work out according to their programme. What the rest of them considered as the instability of Russia and America came in the way. In March, 1915, Mr. Lloyd George had concluded a secret pact

promising Constantinople to Russia, and it was followed in April by the pact of London which secured for Italy the Dodekanese Islands, "a just share of the Mediterranean region adjacent to the province of Adalia" etc. That, however, did not prevent the British Premier from making the famous statement three years later: "Nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace". The doubt that Sir Valentine Chirol suggests that "the earlier pledges given by the Allied powers to the subject-races of Turkey that they should never again be exposed to unrestrained Turkish misrule" would never seem to have occurred to him. A justification of this contradiction offered by Professor Mowat in his "History of European Diplomacy, 1914-1925" is that Mr. Lloyd George's statement was in the nature of an offer, conditional upon Turkey ceasing to fight then and there against the Allies. By persisting in the war until October, 1918, the Turks had forfeited any claims to that pledge. Whatever was the precise significance of the original intentions of the Allies, the Bolshevik Government of Russia repudiated the Tsarist treaties even when their terms were advantageous to Russia on account of their Revolutionary principles, and further disappointed the Allies by continuing indefinitely in power. In September, 1919, Mr. Lloyd George had said, "We cannot settle Turkey till we know what the United States is going to do", evidently betraying the hope that the European rivalry for Constantinople might nevertheless be settled satisfactorily to Europe by handing over its mandate to America. This hope proved futile though at one time a movement in which American initiative was apparent was on foot to secure for America not merely a mandate over Constantinople or Armenia, but indeed, over the whole of Turkey. Three divergent sources like M. Poincaré, Mr. Stannard Baker, and Lord Eustace Percy are agreed that the principal trouble in the Turkish settlement was the impossibility to find an agreement between the Allies themselves. The secret pact of London, which was the condition under which Italy entered the War, was the chief stumbling block and took up more time than anything else, says Mr. Stannard Baker, while Lord Eustace Percy has declared in the House of Commons, "For weeks and for months during the Paris Conference, we delayed making, I do not say a settlement, but in giving any consideration to the Turkish question. It was a question which had been discussed in some detail both in the Departments here and internally with certain of our Allies before the Armistice. It has been made the subject of international agreements, of the merits of which I say nothing here. There was the Sykes-Picot agreement, for instance. There had been more intensive work upon that than any other single subject which was brought before the Paris Conference for settlement, but it was the one subject which the British delegation at Paris was forbidden so much as to mention during the whole of the Conference. No meeting of the Near Eastern Commission of the Conference was allowed to be held." And Monsieur Poincaré in a very interesting article in the *Revue Des Deux Mondes* for March, 1920, describes the course of the Constantinople question as "*tours, retours, et detours*." The final effect of these processes was the decision of the Allies to let the Sultan remain in Constantinople, which was published about the end of February, 1920, and if events had taken the course the Allies expected and wished, that would have been all that the Turks would have had to be thankful for in their Peace Treaty.

The Allies' terms for peace with Turkey were embodied in the Treaty of Sèvres which had its

origin in the discussions between the British, French, and Italian representatives early in 1920 as soon as it became clear that there was little prospect of the United States entering the League of Nations. By the spring of that year the draft Treaty had so far advanced that the Turkish Government were instructed to send a delegation to receive the terms of peace. Tewfik Pasha headed it, the meeting of the Supreme Council held at San Remo at the end of April settled the terms, and on May 10, at the Quai d'Orsay, the Peace Treaty was delivered to the Turkish delegates. The territorial, financial, civil, and military provisions of the Treaty were such as to cause dismay in the whole of Turkey and their severity, which perhaps equalled that of the Treaty with Austro-Hungary, drew even greater attention probably because on account of the greater lapse of time since the war passions had received fullest manifestation. The Ottoman Empire which had an area of 613,500 square miles in 1914 and a population estimated at twenty millions was reduced by this measure to 175,000 square miles and about eight millions of population.

Turkey was to cede Thrace to Greece almost up to the Chatalja lines and if the whole of Lake Derkos was included within Turkish frontiers it was only out of regard for the water-supply of the capital. Tenedos and Imbros were also to be made over to Greece. Not Smyrna only, but also Tireh, Odemish, Akhissar, Aivali, Magnisa, and Berghama, altogether constituting a goodly slice of Asia Minor, were to fall to Greece's share. The situation in this regard was that after five years of an "independent" parliament under Greek administration in this region, it should have the right to go over to Greece by plebiscite. This instrument provided also for Turkey's recognition of the independence of Syria, Armenia, the Hedjaz, and Mesopotamia. The French protectorates over Tunisia, the French zone in Morocco, the British protectorate over Egypt and the Soudan, and British sovereignty in Cyprus came in for similar regularisation. Great Britain further obtained the rights secured by the Ottoman Government through the Suez Canal Treaty of 1888. The territorial provisions also included the control of the "Zone of the Straits" (which consisted of the Dardanelles, the Sea of Marmora, and the Bosphoros) by a commission of the League of Nations.

The military provisions reduced the Turkish army to only 50,000 men including 2,500 officers. Compulsory service was to be abolished in Turkey, and there was to be no Air Force, nor any Navy except for small craft for police purposes. Twenty-five years and twelve years were fixed as the minimum period of service for officers and men respectively.

The financial conditions, which were in no way less thorough, provided for the renunciation of the power of taxation of the Turkish Government in favour of a Finance Commission constituted of Great Britain, France and Italy.

The remaining clauses mainly dealt with Great Britain's mandate in Palestine, Italian sovereignty over the Dodekanese, the constitution of the "Commission of the Straits" which included Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan as predominant partners, and Russia and Greece as seconds, and the incorporation into the Treaty of the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Labour Convention as embodied in the Treaty of Versailles. The preamble enumerated the High Contracting Parties, who were the four principal Allied Powers—Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan—and also Greece, Belgium, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, the Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom, Roumania, Portugal, Armenia, and the Hedjaz on the one hand, and Turkey on the other.

The reply of the Turkish delegation was delivered to the Supreme Council at the end of June, and it put forward the plea that Turkey entered the War not on account of her own desire, but on account of the promptings of the Committee of Union and Progress. The Turkish delegation resigned itself to the loss of Armenia, the Hedjaz, Tunis, Morocco, Lybia, Cyprus, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Palestine. But the composition of the Straits Commission, they insisted, must provide for the inclusion of Turkey and must infringe less on Turkish sovereignty. With regard to Thrace, the reply pointed out that the cession of the territory was a violation of the principle of nationalities on which the Allies had laid so much stress, and it was even more outspoken about the Greek occupation of Smyrna. The Allies' definition of the frontiers of Armenia came in for some consideration and the note chiefly dwelt on territorial provisions.

The Allies' reply to the Turks' reception of their peace terms is important. They dismissed the plea that Turkey did not have full responsibility for entering the War as untenable in the face of their declaration at its beginning that they would guarantee her security in case she remained neutral. It was firmly pointed out to Turkey that her participation in the War had prolonged it by two years as by her action with regard to the Straits, a wedge was driven into their *bloc*, and the question of supplies was rendered most difficult. The Note stated: "The Allies are clear that the time has come when it is necessary to put an end once for all to the empire of the Turks over other nations. The history of the relations between the Porte and the Great Powers in the long period before the war was one long story of repeated and unavailing attempts to put an end to atrocities in Bulgaria, Macedonia, and elsewhere". Regarding the objections of the Turkish Government about the territorial clauses concerning Thrace, Armenia, and Smyrna, it was stated that the Turkish population was in a minority in all these areas, and besides, that the arrangement in Smyrna was analogous to that of Danzig. Some concession was made to the Turkish claims concerning the "Straits Commission", but the Note ended with the grave warning that if the Turkish Government did not sign the Treaty within a period of ten days, that is, within July 27, 1920, "or still more, if it found itself unable to re-establish its authority in Anatolia or to give effect to the Treaty, the Allies in accordance with the terms of the Treaty may be driven to reconsider this arrangement by ejecting the Turks out of Europe once for all." Several days before the ultimatum had elapsed the Turkish Government manifested their willingness to sign the Treaty and it was eventually signed on August 10 at Sèvres from which it takes its name. Riza Tewfik Bey (a pathetic broken man when I met him at Jerusalem in 1923) was the principal Turkish delegate, and all the parties mentioned in the Preamble were represented except Yugo-Slavia and the Hedjaz, the former because of some difference about the appropriation of old Ottoman debts, and the latter because of King Feisal's war with France at the time.

RAGHUNATH ROW.

TREATIES AND POLITICAL PRACTICE.

II. ALWAR.

TILL the middle of the last century Alwar owed allegiance to Jaipur and Bharatpur. Its first relations with the British Government were formed in 1803 when Maharao Rajah Sawasee Baktawar Singh Bahadur was ruling over the State. The Maharao Rajah then accepted the protection of the British Government and an offensive and defensive alliance was

concluded. Alwar was to pay no tribute but its troops were to co-operate with those of the British Government. In 1811 the Maharao of Alwar interfered with the affairs of Jaipur and engaged with a Pathan adventurer to establish his minister on Jaipur gadi. Although an obligation to form no such engagement without the knowledge and consent of the British Government necessarily resulted from the nature of the relations subsisting between the two Governments, it was not specifically included among the provisions of the treaty. A fresh engagement was therefore made in 1811 expressly prohibiting political intercourse with other States without the cognisance and approval of the British Government. This established beyond doubt the subordinate position of Alwar. After the death of Baktawar Singh without any issue in 1850 disputes arose as to who should succeed him. Maharao Banu Singh seized the reins of administration and imprisoned Balawant Singh who was an illegitimate son of the late ruler and to whom the powers of administration were awarded as a result of the compromise arrived at. By an engagement concluded in 1826 Banu Singh was required to agree to release Balwantsingh and make a suitable provision for him. In 1862 adoption sanads were granted to the State. In 1865 the Maharao agreed to give land required for railway purposes free of cost and to compensate the owners. In 1867 an extradition treaty was concluded between Alwar and the British Government. In 1873 British copper coins and in 1877 British silver coins were introduced in the State, and the State agreed to abstain from coining silver in its own mints. In 1879 Alwar was required to suppress the manufacture of salt within the State and to abolish all duties on all articles except intoxicating drugs. In 1902 Postal unity was agreed to, and in 1904 exclusive jurisdiction was ceded to the British Government over State land occupied by the Railway. In 1904 rules for the guidance of the police in the State were introduced and in 1906 made permanent. The history of these treaties conclusively proves the subordinate position of the Maharaja of Alwar, not only in matters relating to intercourse with other States but even in such internal affairs as the manufacture of salt, the minting of coin, jurisdiction over land occupied by railway and even in the administration of Police the State administration was controlled by the British Government. All these treaties were concluded with the Governor General through the Foreign and Political Department. The Maharaja's pretensions, therefore, to treat his state as a politically independent unit, quite separate from and independent of the Government of India, are devoid of any foundation. His relations are not directly with the Crown or the British Government, but through the Government of India which is a subordinate branch of the Home Government and is controlled by the Secretary of State for India who is responsible to Parliament. In the face of these facts, the high-sounding talk in which the Maharaja is accustomed to indulge so often appears ludicrous.

As regards political practice, the history of Alwar clearly shows that the Maharaja is not entitled to claim sovereignty even in domestic affairs. In 1812 Baktawar Singh took possession of certain territory belonging to Jaipur. This was a direct violation of the engagements made by him. A force was moved against him, the usurped territories were returned to Jaipur and he was required to pay Rs. 3 lakhs as compensation for this expedition. Again in 1826 the Maharao, of Alwar Banu Sing, was involved in an attempt on the life of Ahmad Bux Khan, a leader of the Mahomedan faction in Alwar, which was supporting the cause of Balwantsingh, the competitor to the gadi of Alwar. The crime was traced to the Durbar and a British force was advanced on Alwar

and the Maharao was compelled to submit to the adjudication of the claim of Balwantsingh. After the death of Banu Singh in 1857, during the minority of his son Sheodansing, the then ministers got ascendancy over him, and their influence became obnoxious to the Rajput nobles who consequently rose in rebellion and drove away the ministers. A British Political Agent was posted to Alwar; order was restored; and a Council of Regency was formed which was to work under the Political Agent. When Sheodan Singh was on the gadi misrule became rampant. He had sympathies with his Mahomedan ministers; he resumed their hereditary holdings and religious grants and the extravagance of the ruler compelled the British Government to interfere in the affairs of the State. The ruler was deprived of his powers, and a council of management presided over by a British officer whose monthly salary was fixed by the British Government but paid out of Alwar treasury was brought into being. The Chief continued to oppose all measures of reform and to foment dissensions among his Thakurs. He was warned that if he persisted in his recalcitrant attitude, he would be removed from the gadi. His powers however were never restored; and when he died in 1874 a minor was selected as his successor, with the result that the administration was carried on by the Council. These instances clearly show that during the time of the ruler's minority the administration was virtually under the control of the Political Agent; that when there was discontent bordering on rebellion in the State both in 1858 and in 1870 the British Government interfered and restored peace and order; that when the ruler by his continued maladministration oppressed his subjects and made his rule intolerable, the Government of India again interfered, deprived the ruler of his powers and assumed charge of the administration. It will thus be evident that even in internal administration, whenever there was long continued and gross misrule, the Governor General as the head of the Foreign and Political Department interfered and even deprived the ruler of his powers. Is it, therefore, justifiable to contend that even in internal affairs the ruler of Alwar enjoys rights of full sovereignty? The sovereignty such as he enjoys is subject to the important limitation that in domestic affairs also the Maharaja of Alwar has to maintain good administration, and secure proper and just government to his subjects so as not to force them into rebellion or drive them to a breach of peace.

The Maharaja of Alwar as also his fellow-princes are extremely anxious to be free from the interference of the Political Department in their domestic affairs. This claim, as we have pointed out above, is not warranted either by treaties or by political practice. When the Maharaja of Alwar and his brother princes are agitating for independence in their domestic affairs what guarantees are they prepared to give to the Government of India to ensure good government to their subjects?

The Maharaja, the other day, at the banquet which he gave in honour of Sir Harcourt Butler and the other members of the States' Committee waxed eloquent about the position of the Indian Princes. He said: "We have yet to discover and decide what is to be the future goal before the Indian States with their treaties and political practice." It does not really require much effort to discover this goal which has, luckily for the Indian Princes, been clearly and unequivocally laid down in the announcement of August 20, 1917.

If the Maharaja is genuinely loyal to the British Throne, the best way of showing that loyalty is, in our opinion, by giving effect to this policy in his State. But in Alwar there are yet no representative institutions; the people are not associated with the government in any form or in any stage; they have ab-

absolutely no control over administration, legislation, taxation or finance; there is no local self-government worth the name; no primary education, free and compulsory; no public press and no rule of law whatsoever. The despotic nature of the Maharaja's rule was never more strongly demonstrated than when he refused to accede to the very modest popular demand for an inquiry into the shooting affair at Neemuchana. He has clearly failed to understand the spirit of the times and to imbibe the principles underlying the growth of democracy. His own treaties and the political practice followed in regard to his own State have made his position abundantly clear—it is that of a dependent vassal bound to secure good government for his subjects on pain of being deprived of his powers like his illustrious predecessor Shivadansing.

Under Indian Swaraj of course Indian States have to be under the Foreign and Political Department in charge of a minister responsible to the people. Indian princes will then have to adopt the policy of His Majesty's Government announced in 1917. In such case they have nothing to fear from India's democratised constitution. A convention may perhaps be established that there shall be no interference on the part of the Government of India in regard to states in the enjoyment of responsible government. Indian Princes like Alwar therefore seem to me to be deliberately confusing issues and are describing the relations of the States and British India as difficult of solution and are mischievously putting forward the bogey of treaty rights and political practice. But if these treaties and political practice are carefully analysed they do not show any complexity; on the contrary they would help to advance progress in the direction of responsible government. The only thing which would be made impossible when India attains self-government is a tragedy like what happened at Neemuchana. The Maharaja of Alwar has envisaged the future very graphically in a very beautiful manner. He hoped that the States Enquiry Committee "would do something to ensure that our Indian Empire within the greater empire working in harmony with our sister States in British India may fulfil the ideal of the King Emperor of the greatest Empire marching at the head of a gorgeous procession of life accompanied on the one side by his subjects and on the other side by the Indian sovereigns escorted by the peoples of his mighty dominions to move along the great road of progress and good-will to the ultimate destination of freedom and salvation of the world." This indeed is a very fascinating picture. We do not know if the Committee is or is not going to do something for the realisation of this ideal. But we want to put it to His Highness the Maharaja of Alwar, whether he himself does or does not stand for freedom and salvation. If he does not stand for popular liberties, as one is forced to infer from his previous record, what is the use in prating of these things and yet pretending ignorance as to the goal of Indian States as he has been doing?

G. R. ABHYANKAR.

OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

DELHI, March 2.

THE RAILWAY BUDGET.

ALTHOUGH the Railway Budget was welcomed as satisfactory there were the usual complaints and severe attacks against the Railway Board which came in for severe censure for its stiff-necked policy about Indianisation. Mr. Mehta told the House that he was in possession of 'shoals of applications' which

were rejected by the Railway Board on grounds which they themselves best knew, although the applicants were all well qualified men. He also showed how the Board had shown utter disregard for public opinion when it had imported an European with lesser qualification to fill up a vacancy in Bombay. Speaker after speaker complained of the way the Railway Board had managed its affairs in utter disregard of Indian feeling. Col. Gidney of course championed the Anglo-Indian cause and said they had a right to be there for the yeoman service rendered by the community. He was assured that Indians would not deny any Indian community or any individual who considered India as his motherland his legitimate rights, and that the sooner the Anglo-Indian community realised that they were Indians and were to sink or swim with them, the better. Mr. Cocks's speech which showed 'the fossilised mentality' furnished ample evidence that the Railways were meant mainly for providing employment for Europeans and affording them transport facilities. Government's reply was that their policy was 'fair field for all and no favour'. A pious phrase seldom acted upon!

The Railway Administration was also attacked for turning a deaf ear to the grievances of the employees. Col. Gidney and Mr. N. M. Joshi pleaded for the appointment of a committee to go thoroughly into their grievances. Col. Gidney made it clear that if their grievances remained unredressed, it was surely not due to lack of attempts to draw the attention of the Railway Board to them, and complained that the power of dismissal vested in the officers was used autocratically. In the matter of provident fund and gratuities also, Anglo-Indians were, in his opinion, dealt with harshly and were sometimes made to work even sixteen hours a day! Col. Gidney suggested as an alternative the establishment of a Complaints Department but was told by the Member in charge that they had already instituted one, and could not agree to the appointment of a Committee. But the House was not told what the Complaints Department had so far achieved in the direction of redressing those grievances.

The Government's railway freight policy was also severely criticised. This has been a long standing grievance and has been deliberately overlooked in spite of the recommendations of the Industrial Commission and the Acworth Committee. The railway freights have been so manipulated as to give encouragement to the foreign importer and exporter at the expense of the indigenous producer. Thakur Muktar Singh instanced the case of sugar and sulphate of ammonia and showed how Government had decreased the rate on the imported articles and increased it in the case of the indigenous product. The grievances of the third class passengers as usual roused much sympathy but failed to make any impression on the cool-headed administrators. Under the Guillotine the Railway Budget was passed without any cut. Even the Railway Board demand which had been thrown out successively for the last two years and had raised such an animated debate could not this year be cut down, thanks to the thin attendance of the non-official members. The question of reviewing the effects of the separation of railway finance from the general finance seems to have been shelved although Mr. Neogy urged that it was time to review the whole position, inasmuch as a good deal of control of the Assembly had been usurped by the Agents.

PROTECTION OF INDIGENOUS INDUSTRIES.

The Government introduced two Bills for the protection and development of indigenous industries, after the bills were examined by the Tariff Board.

The Bill providing for fostering and developing the manufacture of plywood tea-chests in British India was introduced, but its further consideration was postponed as it was thought that the time since the publication of the Tariff Board's report and the announcement of the decision of the Government of India was too short for the members to study it in detail. The Commerce Member then introduced a Bill for giving protection to the steel industry (waggon and underframes). In case of waggons and underframes the policy had succeeded and there was every hope that the industry would soon be self-supporting with the aid of protection it was proposed to give. The recommendations of the Tariff Board about giving protection to steel castings were not accepted by Government at which considerable dissatisfaction was expressed. Mr. Birla scented the introduction of Imperial Preference in the proposal made by Government, but Government denied it. The Bill was referred to a Select Committee, where it will probably undergo a good deal of change.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

Sir Basil Blackett presented his sixth and last budget which has been well received by all sections in general. It may not be 'spectacular' since it neither seeks to impose or remit taxation, thus giving little scope for fireworks from either side of the House. Sir Basil may well take pride in having stabilised the Indian finance and given a long awaited relief to the provinces from the Weston Settlement, which hung like a mill-stone round their

necks. This now leaves the provinces free from anxiety on the score of the inroads of the Central Government, and they can now use their revenues for the nation-building purposes. He has put an end to deficit budgets and leaves to his successor the work of readjustment of the burden of taxation in the light of the recommendations of the Taxation Enquiry Committee, a work he had set his hands to but could not accomplish. The only unsatisfactory feature is the amount of the Military Budget which seems again to set aside all considerations of economy and retrenchment, suggested by the Inchope Committee. With the question of provincial contributions solved, any further surpluses will have to be applied to further reductions of taxation.

THE RAILWAY BUDGET IN THE UPPER HOUSE.

In the Council of State the debate on the Railway Budget was a formal affair, the only resolution of some importance moved being for the establishment of a central college for railway engineering, which was intended to put a stop to non-Indian recruitment for the railway engineering services. Government had already gone into the problem, but the special officer who was deputed to make inquiries in the matter reported unfavourably. An amendment was moved so as to enable Government to give subsidies to the existing institutions for training these men but was lost. Government stuck to their scheme of recruitment through competitive examination by the Public Service Commission. The resolution was lost without a division.

REVIEW SECTION.

NATIONAL CHARACTER.

NATIONAL CHARACTER AND THE FACTORS IN ITS FORMATION. BY ERNEST BARKER. (Methuen & Co., London.) 1927. 9 x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$. pp. 298. 10s. 6d.

"A CLOSELY thought, closely argued, closely printed solid work of a solid scholar," that is the idea left in the mind of the reader as he lays down this volume. It is heavy reading, both for the contents and for its style, but nevertheless one which grips the attention and stimulates thought throughout.

We are familiar with glib talks and easy generalisations of the average man and woman regarding national life, national character and national tendencies. Something of the easy assurance of these popular judges infects the average writer on social topics and too often we find generalisations not too well founded on facts which the propagandist and the tub-thumper makes use of to point his particular moral. It is more seldom that we find a scholar of the stamp of Principal Barker subjecting national character and destiny to a close and searching analysis to discover the exact strands that go to make its warp and woof as a preliminary to a judgment on national problems. The author has made a serious attempt to disentangle the various factors that go to build up national character which he classifies under two heads, the material and the spiritual. Under the material factor he distinguishes the genetic, the geographical and the economic factors. And under spiritual he distinguishes the national spirit, law and government, religion,

language, literature and thought, and ideas and systems of thought. He takes up each of these factors separately and shows how far and in what precise manner each circumstance has moulded and shaped the character of the people of England. He closes this survey with a brief chapter on the problems that England will have to face in the future and indicates some lines along which progress must be sought.

The prevailing note of the whole study is that of a sturdy conservatism combined with a moderate amount of national pride and a somewhat restrained optimism. He makes out his people to be a great historical type whose present is deeply imbedded in its past and exclusively determined by race, geography, economic history and the various historical circumstances of a more spiritual character. Into this study he has thrown a vast amount of scholarship and plodding, an earnest research and great powers of searching analysis, but, it is to be feared, a great deal less of imagination than one would feel to be necessary for a proper appreciation of the historic growth of a nation and its character. The too exclusively analytical method pursued by the author has perhaps made him more or less oblivious of the character of the history as a whole. The generous imagination working on the materials of history which can visualise the nation as a whole growing from age to age as a living entity, an organic whole, far greater than its parts, drawing its nourishment from its historic environments and roots but overpassing the elements that go to build it up, is largely lacking in the author.

As a rule the outlook of the author towards the changing phases of British life and character is free from unhealthy orthodoxy. All that has been is for the author the best that could be and unmistakable modern tendencies are also healthful to a large extent. Thus he is quite indulgent towards growing Feminism as a social and political factor, having once made up his mind that women are as a whole conservative and readily adopt and pursue ends and ideas of the people just the same as men. But the inborn conservatism of the professional historian puts limitations upon his powers of imagination. Unlike H. G. Wells in his 'Outlines of History,' his mind cannot make great sweeps of imagination for visualising whole eras of history as a great continuous growth, nor plunge into the unrealised future and shape principles in the light of a clearly imagined future very different from the present. On the contrary he is frankly hostile, for instance, to what he calls the "false internationalism of German reformers, who would sink the nation with all its precious freight, in the barren sea of international socialism." Nationality as conceived by Mill and Mazzini is to him the last word of wisdom in the way of social organisation. Only he is prepared to recognise, consistently with his habit to bow to a *fait accompli*, the League of Nations. The author's outlook on future, rock-bound on his history, refuses to take a single step beyond established facts; and he fails to recognise the incontestable social fact of which the League of Nations is only a small emblem, that Nationalism has for a good long time been in the melting pot. He does not even realise that the Dominions overseas whom he honours only with a passing mention have really taken England beyond the narrow bounds of nationhood. The British are a nation, but the British Empire is not; it is an international organisation moulded by convention into the simulacrum of a national State.

His analysis of the various factors which go to build up the nation is likewise affected by the merits and faults of the whole work. The analysis is laborious, painstaking, exact and methodical, but it is lacking in the comprehensive grasp of facts which could only be contributed by a generous imagination. Thus, while the author guards himself against a too precise appraisal of the characteristics of the Alpine and Mediterranean stock which go to make up the racial basis of the British race, he still fondly lingers on some characteristics of these races. It is somewhat surprising that such a precise student of history as Principal Barker does not realise that the supposed virtues of the Alpine and Mediterranean races are themselves matters highly speculative and rest on extremely slender foundations. But more characteristic is his failure to appreciate the fact that the race by itself is not an absolutely static entity but changes with time, not merely on account of changes in geographic and moral environments but to a large extent merely by lapse of time. To isolate the fundamental racial characteristics and look upon geographical and moral environments as sole determinants of change is to lose sight of the

fact that the evolution of man is organic and that the inner urge for change and external environments act and react upon one another in an inscrutable manner, so that it is hardly possible to isolate the elements contributed by environments from changes from the inner impulse of man. A well developed synthetic imagination would have laid less emphasis on the isolated factors than on the organic evolution as a whole.

The author has on the whole made great efforts to maintain a dispassionate attitude towards facts, but the inevitable bias of a conservative and insular Briton makes itself felt at many places. The most striking example is the attitude of the author in connection with the mandates. His view is that the theory of mandates is a distinctly English contribution under a French name. He looks upon the idea of trusteeship of Government as a distinctly British idea and makes the extraordinary claim that General Smuts who introduced this idea into the League of Nations Covenant was inspired by the British idea. One would have thought that the Roman-Dutch law with which General Smuts was even more familiar could have given him the idea of mandates just as well as common law. The idea of trusteeship in Government is so little a distinctly British idea that you can find it well developed even if you looked so far afield as ancient India. It is surprising also that Mr. Barker, while he makes so much of the idea of mandates, does not stop to consider what a hash has been made of the doctrine by the mandatories, notably England. The mandates are little more now than scraps of paper and English constitutional lawyers have claimed for the mandatory sovereign rights in mandated territories and there has even been resentment at the very modest claims of the League to hold the mandatories accountable in a very moderate measure for their administration. If the concept of mandates is distinctly English, the way it is being worked out by the Britisher, assuming that it represents the true British concept of trusteeship, hardly gives one much cause for congratulation.

It is impossible in this brief review to do anything like justice to the vast field covered by this book. We can only say that though the outlook and the judgment of the author have been occasionally marred by his want of sympathy with new theories of social reconstruction the whole work bristles with masterly analyses and a remarkable grasp of the minutest facts and there is hardly a page in it that does not stimulate thought. There is a remarkable originality displayed by the author in his theory of history which challenges attention and, if it occasionally provokes questionings, it leaves one with a sense of having realised new points of view in looking at facts of social history. A vivacious imagination and complete rapport with the surging new thoughts of the world are the only things one misses, things which would have made this remarkable study a perfect gem.

NARES C. SEN-GUPTA.

THE NEW CHINA.

THE NEW SOUL IN CHINA. By GEORGE RICHMOND GROSE. (The Abingdon Press, New York.) 1927. 7 x 4 1/4. pp. 152. \$1.

THIS is a readable little book by one who knows China well, and has given his life to her service. Within a very small compass it will give the busy reader an insight into the inner meaning of the struggle in China. It is a fight to the death between the old autocratic Conservative régime and the new democratic movement. It is militarism and special privilege over against national sovereignty and democracy. "On the one side are war lords with armies of hirelings, grown fat and powerful, impoverishing the people by oppression and cruelties which rival the tyrannies of the Dark Ages. On the other side, students and teachers in the schools and universities, the merchants and the Christian population of China in an overwhelming majority."

In spite of the brutal cruelties and wanton crimes which have marred its course, the nationalist movement is no mere Red Revolution. It is the awakening of a nation to self-consciousness and self-respect. The passing of the dynastic system of government, and the violent reaction against the general arrogance of the West—especially the attitude of America—has ushered in the New Era. The day of Western domination in politics and business, in education and religion, is gone for ever. Sun Yat Sen, who embodied the very soul of the new nationalism, stood for freedom from foreign exploitation and freedom from military tyranny. But even more, he stood for spiritual freedom. "In the deepest sense the struggle in China is a spiritual revolution which is shaking the very foundations of the old social, economic and political order. It is the rising tide of a new life. It is the dawn of a new civilization." Beyond the present travail, the visionary may see the birth of a new China which shall rank among the first nations of the world.

For there are already signs big with promise. Militarism is going out of fashion. "The big battalions are beginning to destroy themselves. The people, hitherto divided by provincial and factional interests, are united in their demand for the equality of human rights, for industrial justice and for international fair play. The present troubles are the troubles of youth and they will be outgrown. As yet no wise and responsible leadership has come into being. The republic was born twenty years before its time. The people, ninety per cent. illiterate, without interest in politics or experience in representative government, became the easy prey of venal politicians and selfish war lords. The great forces of western civilisation—intellectual renaissance, political democracy and the application of modern science to industrial development—evolved in Europe in three hundred years, have been released in China simultaneously in fifteen." No wonder there is unrest and revolution.

What then is required? First, the stranglehold of militarism must be broken. Then the stabilising influences of education must be brought to bear upon the masses, who will thus develop a sense of social responsibility. China has need of leaders like Mahatma Gandhi. "The need of China," says Prof. Soothill, "is a new soul in her men of capacity. She has millions willing to die for her but few in high places willing with a single mind to live for her." If only a Servants of China Society would arise to rebuild the foundations of her government upon "personal integrity, public righteousness and true humanity!"

An interesting feature of the book is a careful analysis of the place of the Christian Church in

China. It must be remembered that the religious situation is very different from that in India: it is not so much a question of competing religious systems as a choice between religion and no religion between a spiritual and a materialistic view of the universe. As is well known, China is the home of widespread and violent anti-Christian propaganda. This is due to a misunderstanding of what real Christianity is: it is wrongly thought that Christian theology and modern science are in opposition. Christianity and western capitalism are identified; and Christianity is regarded as a foreign religion seeking to denationalise the youth and to oppose the grand and ancient culture of Mencius and Confucius. Although certain missionaries have given ground for such charges, they are generally as untrue in China as they would be in India.

But this is not the whole story. The intellectual renaissance is furnishing both the field and the machinery for the greatest religious revival of modern times. Concurrent with this is the resurgence of a passion for social reform: there is widespread concern about commercialised vice, official corruption and the ravages of the opium traffic. In spite of a vogue of mechanistic philosophy and the behaviourist psychology, there is a strong undercurrent of spiritual expectancy, and the eyes of many thinking men are turning towards the figure of the "strange Man upon the Cross" who is still the everlasting symbol of human redemption. "Judged by every test, the dominant moral and spiritual force in China to-day is Jesus Christ. He alone is leading an aggressive movement for the freedom of the people. His principles of living are being recognised more and more as final."

The position of the Christian missionary is also analysed. He is no longer to be regarded as the herald of a formal doctrine for men's salvation. "His mission is not to give the baptism of a nominal Christianity or the vogue of Western civilization." His task is to show men the character of Jesus. It is to show men "the Infinite Father in the face of Jesus Christ; to bring men into living fellowship with him, the power of a new life, and to proclaim by word and deed that all men of all races and nations are brethren". For Christ, "the Chief of Burden-bearers, the Hero and Leader of men in self-sacrifice and suffering", shares with us the shame of our sins till they are lost in his forgiveness. He shows men a way of life which satisfies their highest conscience. As John Stuart Mill says, "The best rule of conduct for the ordinary man is to live so as to have the approval of Jesus Christ." And his enthralling influence makes personal or social goodness possible. "For sixty generations, men have been coming to him with their secrets of sin and shame and trouble and finding forgiveness and joy and peace".

The task of the Christian in China is thus very simple and very noble. It is to reproduce the spirit of the life of Christ. It is to promote the spiritual life through fellowship with God. It is to raise men from moral bankruptcy to self-respect. It is to "proclaim the primacy of personal character." It is to "exalt the human values". It is to raise its voice on behalf of the poor and down-trodden in every land. "It is to teach men the secret of living together". It is to make God real. "In a world where multitudes have guessed about God, philosophized about God, and groped after God, Jesus lived a life of such self-authenticating spiritual grandeur that when men try to think about God they can say nothing so satisfying and so adequate as to say that God is like Christ". And so, the Christian is to show what Christ is like and to make him real.

HOBSON ON INDUSTRIALISM.

THE INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM. By J. A. HOBSON. (P. S. King & Son, Ltd., London.) 1927. 8¾ × 5½. pp. 338. 7s. 6d.

THE CONDITIONS OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE. By J. A. HOBSON. (George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London.) 1927. 7½ × 4¾. pp. 123. 4s. 6d.

MR. HOBSON'S "The Industrial System" was first published in 1909. The present issue is a reprint of the second edition. The book is described in the subtitle as "An Inquiry into Earned and Unearned Income". But it is not simply that; for it also contains incidentally a considerable amount of what may be called "Descriptive Economics"; much more indeed than is usual in books dealing with the theory of distribution. In the main, however Mr. Hobson is concerned with presenting a more satisfactory theory of distribution than has been formulated hitherto. The main lines of Mr. Hobson's analysis as well as his chief points of difference with the dominant "neo-classical" school are well known. The most salient features of Mr. Hobson's theory are, his division of the expenses of production into cost and surplus and a further division of the surplus element into productive and unproductive surplus. He contends that the conditions of free competition and close bargaining which the 'marginalists' postulate are unreal and that they can, therefore, offer no basis for a valid theory of distribution. He also pleads for a human interpretation of industry, for a 'positive' conception of costs interpreted in terms of real human effort. This analysis he unfolds in relation to the various parts of the industrial system and further discusses all measures of reform, etc., in the light of his theory. Mr. Hobson's views have been discussed so many times and at so great a length by now that it is fortunately superfluous in a short notice of the reprint even to indicate the points of criticism. A novel sidelight on the nature of the theory is, however, thrown when he attempts to apply it at length in affording the solution of the acute problem of industrial strife.

Mr. Hobson approaches the problem of Industrial Peace by laying his finger upon surplus wealth as "everywhere the chief source of discord". He doubts the possibility of a natural transformation of capitalism into a system making for industrial peace that industrialists like Henry Ford and economists like Prof. Carver have been preaching from America. For he points out that though the workers may become part-owners of industrial concerns this will not put any real power of controlling industry in their hands and the fight is as much for power as for gain. The remedies usually proposed, viz., those of setting up boards of conciliation or arbitration break down on the claim of the right to strike or lock-out. This claim of workers or capitalists engaged in any particular industry to hold up operations in other industries or in the case of basic industries even the whole economic life of a nation Mr. Hobson characterises as entirely unsocial. The problem of finding a fair wage—another difficult problem that conciliation and arbitration boards have always to face—will also remain insoluble as long as each industry is looked upon as a separate unit. For in each separate industry no reasonable basis can be found for the apportionment of the surplus. Mr. Hobson advocates the consideration of costs and of surplus over the whole field of industry. There is a subsistence or minimum wage level and so also is there a subsistence remuneration for capital. Labour or capital in no industry can be allowed to get anything less than the minimum necessary for its subsistence; when owing to excep-

tional circumstances it cannot earn this a policy of subsidising from the "surplus" must be resorted to. The "surplus" accruing in all industries will have to be pooled together and this will be available for the purpose of affording occasional subsidies to particular industries, for furnishing the saving fund and for extending communal services. Such is Mr. Hobson's solution for the problem of industrial strife. It is obvious that the attitude of the State with regard to the economic life of the nation must change considerably before the plan can become politically practicable. Mr. Hobson also visualises a greater influence in the near future for such international organizations as the League of Nations. Mr. Hobson differs from the State Socialists or advocates of rapid nationalization in thinking that the machinery of the State is not competent to conduct industries itself. On the other hand his plan differs from the proposals for conciliation and arbitration legislation chiefly in pleading for a consideration of the question over the whole field of industry; and in this he seems to be mainly correct. But the usual objections against compulsory arbitration also hold against Mr. Hobson's proposals and it may be doubted whether his costs and surpluses prove more easy of statistical determination than the usual fair wage.

D. R. GADGIL.

SUN YAT SEN'S POLICY

SAN MIN CHU I OR THE THREE PRINCIPLES OF THE PEOPLE. By DR. SUN YAT SEN. (Translated into English by Frank W. Price and Edited by L. T. CHEN.) (China Committee, Institute of Pacific Relations, Shanghai.) 1927. 9 × 5½. pp. 514. \$4.

MR. FRANK PRICE has done invaluable service to the English people by presenting to them in a handsome volume in an English garb the sixteen lectures which Dr. Sun Yat Sen delivered before a Chinese audience in their own language. Dr. Sun, as is well known, was the head of a revolutionary movement in China which culminated in 1911 in the overthrow of the Manchu Government and the establishment of a Republic. He had moreover the privilege of being the first president of the Chinese Republic, though it was only for a brief period.

San Min Chu I or the Three Principles of the People was the theme on which the learned Doctor spoke. The first was the Principle of Nationalism, the second that of Democracy and the third the principle of Livelihood. On each of these three principles the Doctor proposed to give six lectures but his unfortunate demise in March 1925 left incomplete the intended series of lectures on the last principle.

In the first of his lectures on Nationalism Dr. Sun Yat Sen warned his countrymen that though they were a homogeneous race by reason of blood, kinship, common language, common livelihood, common religion and common habits they lacked the spirit of nationalism and were properly regarded by the foreigners as a sheet of loose sand. He very much lamented that the unity of the Chinese people stopped short at the clan and never extended to the nation. Though China is vast and more populous than Japan, the former is despised, in the Doctor's opinion, owing to lack of a national spirit. Dr. Sun then proceeds to emphasize the importance of a numerous population. As compared to other countries China's population is dwindling and this he considers to be politically perilous. "Our new policy," he said, "calls for increase of population and preservation of the race".

The second lecture is devoted to the political and economic domination of China by foreign nations.

Therein he shows that economic oppression is in fact more severe than political oppression which is otherwise called Imperialism. Dr. Sun believed in protective tariff as a means to shield native industries and trade. He reproved his people for preferring the foreign to the native cloth; for that, he believed, brought out the ruin of the native industry. The confidence of the Chinese in foreign banks seems to be as strong as that of the Indians. "He (the Chinaman) does not ask whether the foreign bank is reliable or not, whether it pays high or low interest. If he hears that the bank is run by foreigners and bangs out a foreign sign he swallows the sedative, feels very safe and invests his money. Even if the interest is very low he is quite satisfied." According to his estimate the economic domination costs China an annual loss of \$1,200,000,000.

His third lecture discloses a search on his part for the reasons for the loss of nationalism. Eventually he discovered that the greatest reason was their subjection to alien races. He apprehended that the obsession of Chinese youth with the luring doctrine of cosmopolitanism is injurious to the growth of a national spirit; so he exhorted his countrymen to cultivate nationalism and discard cosmopolitanism.

The fourth lecture deals with topics connected with the late world-war. It is interesting to note what Sun Yat Sen thinks to be the result of the War. To quote his words, "the weaker, smaller nations not only did not secure self-determination and freedom but found themselves under an oppression more terrible than before." He prophesied that the future world will be divided into two camps, the oppressed and the oppressors.

In the fifth lecture possibilities of reviving China's nationalism have been explored. That could be done in his opinion by awakening the people to an understanding of China's real position. "Understanding is difficult, action easy" is his motto. When people really understand the position they act according to the necessity. "If we attempt a revival," says he, "without understanding the situation all hope will disappear for ever and the Chinese people will soon be destroyed." He hopes that when once the national spirit takes root in the heart of the people it will transform the clan struggle into a struggle with alien races and eliminate the savage feuds within the country. The lecturer has suggested two ways of resisting a foreign power, the one positive and the other negative. Arouse the national spirit, seek solutions for the problems of democracy and livelihood and struggle against the powers. This is the positive way. The other is non-co-operation and passive resistance. Our readers will read with interest and instruction his observations on Gandhi's non-co-operation practised in India. "The Indian people have no way of resisting the political oppression, but they are meeting the economic oppression with Gandhi's policy of non-co-operation. What is non-co-operation? The people of India will not furnish what the British need and what the British furnish the Indians do not want. For instance if a Britisher wants a labourer the Indian will not work for him; the British offer the Indian people all kinds of goods, but the Indians will not use them and they use their own native products instead. When Gandhi's plan was first announced, the British thought it of no importance and so ignored Gandhi, but after a long time non-co-operation societies began to appear in numbers and British business was seriously affected. So the British put Gandhi in prison. If we seek the reason why India could get results from a non-co-operation policy we will find it in the ability of the people of the whole country to put the policy into practice".

How to restore the standing of the Chinese nation is the subject of the last lecture, in which he points out that China's ancient greatness was due mainly to her high moral standards; therefore she must recover and use the best in her past; and must also learn the strong points of the West, viz. scientific knowledge and methods.

The next six lectures are devoted to the subject of democracy. Democracy, according to Dr. Sun, means the sovereignty of the people. After an elaborate and scholarly examination of the several periods of human history the lecturer came to the conclusion that democracy was suitable for the Chinese people. But he was not a blind imitator of the West. Europeans rebelled and fought for liberty because they had too little of it. But "we, because we have had too much liberty without any unity and resisting power and because we have become a sheet of loose sand, must break down individual liberty and become pressed together with an unyielding body like the firm rock." Liberty, equality and fraternity were the watchwords of the French Revolution. But the Chinese watchword should be people's nationalism, people's sovereignty, people's livelihood." Dr. Sun Yat Sen contests the dictum of Rousseau about the natural equality of men. He avers that men are naturally unequal; but the essence of equality lies in the spirit to serve mankind and not in the ability to exploit.

The topic dealt with in the last four lectures is in relation to the principle of livelihood, which, the learned doctor exhorts us to believe, is socialism, communism, utopianism. The problem of livelihood arose with the invention of machinery and with the natural substitution of natural power for human labour in the most civilized nations. With every invention man power is released and therefore the question of subsistence has become a pressing one. In fact the social problem determines the course of history and subsistence is the heart of the social problem. The methods suggested by the doctor for the carrying out of the principles of livelihood are (1) equalization of land-ownership and (2) regulation of capital. With an originality of conception the doctor formulates a scheme for the purpose of working out the first method. The landowner should mention the value of his land to the Government and the Government should levy a land-tax accordingly. There is no danger of any land being under-valued since the Government is empowered to buy back the land at the same price. When land values have thus been fixed, a law should be enacted by which all increase thereafter not due to any improvements made by the owner should revert to the community. The doctor's observations on the second method also arrest our attention. China, being poor, he says, cannot remain content with merely regulating private capital by means of income-tax but she must also develop State capital. To build up State capital is to develop State industries. For money was capital in the commercial age but machinery is the capital in this industrial age. The problem of livelihood will be solved only when all have food and very cheap food. To achieve this the doctor thinks: "China must champion native goods and boycott foreign goods." He deplored the fact that a large number of the Chinese were not working. "They are sharing but not creating wealth. Is this not true of India also?" The doctor has something instructive to say regarding the exportation of food from India. "India has not only an insufficient food-supply but experiences yearly famines, yet she holds the third place every year among the nations which ship food to Europe."

It is a matter of profound regret that Dr. Sun Yat Sen died when two of his intended lectures had yet to

be delivered. The doctor is endowed with clear vision, originality of thought, and natural perspicacity. The lectures remind us of the saying of Plato that philosophers must be kings and kings must be philosophers. It is a pity that Dr. Sen Yat Sen resigned the presidentship of the Chinese republic in favour of Yuan Shih-Kai. But this was natural enough as he pinned his hopes on the awakening of the masses of the people. He therefore preferred to devote himself to the task of educating the people to an understanding of the fundamentals of democracy and uplifting their economic standards. There being much in common between Indian and Chinese conditions, the book is full of interest to the people of this country and as such should be read by them.

N. G. CHAPEKAR.

ARE THE IRISH A RIDDLE ?

THE RIDDLE OF THE IRISH. By J. C. MOLONY
(Methuen & Co., Ltd., London.) 1927. 7¼ × 5.
pp. 248.

THERE is no riddle about the Irish and it is vain for Mr. Molony or anyone else to pretend that there is or was. A more recent writer than Mr. Molony might advance further proof of the riddle theory, if he were a believer in it, from the fact that another member of Mr. Molony's own service, retired like himself, was recommended to the King by the Free State Cabinet for the appointment of Governor-General of the Free State in succession to H. E. Mr. Healy. But an opponent of the theory might also find an argument on his side from the very same fact. There is no riddle of the Irish. They are a very sensible people and their selection of Governors-General proves this. They are a plain, simple people who for generations, and some say for seven centuries, opposed a Government from without and in the most natural manner in the world.

In the course of this period of opposition they acquired a certain reputation for being a mysterious people, full of contradictions and antithetical characteristics, loveable and odious, warm and cold, gloomy and bright, dull and witty, religious, and murderous. But the mystery was a sheer optical delusion and depended entirely on the point of view of the observer. Mr. Molony himself says, "Man is very much the creature of surrounding material and moral circumstances". And in this, he says, may be found the solution of the Riddle of the Irish. He is right, for the Irish were and are a riddle only to those who ignore the surrounding material. Most of the observers who found the Irish a riddle were part of the surrounding material themselves and forgot to take it into account. In other words they expected that what appeared to be right and just and natural to an Englishman in his own free country should appear right and just and natural to the Irishman. Even Mr. Molony himself, though indeed he is one of ourselves, is influenced to some extent by his upbringing amongst a certain class. This is not to say he is unfair. He boasts that in matters of opinion he has endeavoured to speak impartially and in matters of fact accurately. This is most certainly true. I have never read a book about Ireland of which the author could make the boast with greater justification. But nevertheless there was probably something in the Molony subconscious that made it necessary for him to take off his glasses and wipe the mist away from them from time to time before he achieved what he has achieved, this excellent, impartial, truthful description of Ireland. Or it may have been the long distance from which he frequently looked back to Ireland, as we all do, that made his picture of her so much nearer the

truth than the close-up studies of those who can only tell of the particular vice or the particular virtue which it is their particular aim at the moment to portray.

To an Irishman who has, like Mr. Molony, devoted the best part of his life to India, this book is a rare treat. It is a wonderful picture of Ireland. There is a most interesting comparison of India and Ireland, which, of course, will be appreciated most by those of us, who, like Mr. Molony, have come from one to serve and live in the other. But even the less fortunate reader who belongs only to one country or the other or to neither will find in this book an entertaining study as true to life as ever a study of a people was. And Trinity College, Dublin, will appreciate the author's appreciation of his *alma mater*.

J. T. DONOVAN.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE RELIGION OF ZARATHUSTRA. By
I. J. S. TARAPOREWALA (Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar.) 1926. 6½ × 4. pp. 180.

THE reading public is much indebted to Prof. Taraporewala for bringing out in book form the essentials of Zoroastrianism. Outside the Parsi circle few people know what Zoroastrianism is and fewer still who have any idea of the close resemblance that exists between the Vedic Religion and the Religion of Zarathustra. The languages of the Vedic hymns as well as the Gaelic chants of this great reformer are so similar that, as the author rightly points out, "a mere phonetic change often suffices to translate a passage from the one into the other, keeping at the same time the sense absolutely intact. The differences are not greater than what are found between two dialects of one original tongue."

But it is not merely the resemblance between the Vedic and Avestan languages that interests us, but also the identity of certain religious and ethical conceptions. In the Rigveda, for instance, *Varuna* or *Varunamitra* is looked upon as the god who is in charge of the moral order of the universe. *Varuna*, therefore, stands for an ethical conception of life—a conception which later on was lost in the purely metaphysical speculations of the *Upanishads*; certain modern scholars including Pandit Sitanath Tatwabhushan of the Brahma Samaj maintain that the *Upanishads* contain elements of theism that are essentially ethical. I find it difficult to subscribe to this view; the conception of an ethical theism is essentially a modern growth; I mean that it is especially in modern times that people have come to realise that the quality of belief will be determined solely in terms of its effect upon conduct. If we except that great book *Rigveda* we find that the whole process of religious evolution in India has been till quite recently in the direction of subordinating ethical considerations to a purely metaphysical conception of life; and till I came across the history and literature of Zoroastrianism, I have been wondering where those ethical beginnings of theism of which we have ample evidence in *Rigveda* were lost: but now I find, and Prof. Taraporewala confirms my view, that Zoroastrianism, stripped of its later accretions, is really speaking, either the legitimate growth of the religion of *Varuna* or both the religion of *Varuna* and that of Zarathustra are aspects of a larger ethical theism which is now lost to us. Anyway the study of Zoroastrianism ought to prove as interesting as the study of *Rigveda* and Prof. Taraporewala has indeed

simplified the task of a beginner by writing this short introduction.

G. Y. CHITNIS.

MRS. ANNIE BESANT. By GEOFFREY WEST.
(Gerald Howe, Ltd., London.) 1927. 8½ × 5¼.
pp. 89. 3s. 6d.

THIS, as the author says, is the only attempt yet made to deal with the life of this great woman in an impartial manner. The author himself is neither a Theosophist nor an anti-Theosophist and is thus evidently a fit person for the task. In the first chapter Mr. West remarks that "the life of Mrs. Besant has been in fact an adventure too strange not to be true" and in the succeeding chapters has dealt with her as a pioneer, a spiritual pilgrim and a unique personality. In the short space of thirty-six pages in chapter second are neatly put together the important events in the life of Mrs. Besant till the year 1889 when she met Madame H. P. Blavatsky and later joined the Theosophical Society.

Chapter third opens with the sentence, "Mrs. Besant has been compared by her opponents to a stage player who retreats continually behind the scenes to reappear each time in a new character", but the author is satisfied that the changes, though suddenly announced, have seldom been suddenly arrived at and in fact he sees, rightly enough, only two such changes, viz. (1) from Christianity to Atheism and (2) from Atheism to Theosophy. In chapter fourth the author has culled from various theosophical sources a brief account of the beginnings and general progress of the Theosophical Society and Mrs. Besant's part in the movement. In crowding into this brief space the whole history of the Society of the last fifty years, the author had necessarily to pass in brief review a large number of incidents and could not do full justice to them, which is likely to present them to the uninitiated in wrong perspective.

In the last chapter the author raises the question, "Will the reputation of Mrs. Besant stand in the next five hundred years?" We may all surmise but only the future can tell. But if the author can find millions of men to-day who have not heard the name of this great woman, it is obvious that after 500 years the number of these must greatly increase. The author concludes by paying his tribute to this great personality in the following words: "As a phenomenon of sheer energy, of unflinching courage, of noble sincerity, she will always live in the memories of all who have known her. She is one of the most remarkable of living women". We agree, and more than agree. We have no hesitation in saying that the book makes interesting and thought-provoking reading.

V. C. GOKHALE.

BOLSHEVISM IN AMERICAN LABOUR UNIONS. By JOHN A. DYCHE. (Boni & Liveright, New York.) 1926. 7¾ × 5. pp. 224.

MR. DYCHE, the writer of the book, was an official of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union in America (New York) from 1904 to 1914 and now he is himself an employer. In this book he depicts the effects of the policy of the present officials of the Union under the influence of what M. Dyche calls extremist theories. This Union is one of the most important Unions in U.S.A. Its members are mostly Jews from the Eastern part of Europe or Yiddish and number more than 100,000. It has an agreement with the employers which is known as the Protocol of Peace signed in 1910.

Mr. Dyche holds that the officials of the Unions who depend upon the favour of the members for election do not generally take an independent view when they meet the employers or in public or in Union meetings, but support the action of members, whether right or wrong, and that the result of such use of their power of the Union is to penalise larger employers who get the work done inside the factories, as the Union can put pressure upon such employers. On account of this policy, the larger employers are unable to compete with smaller employers and with those who get their work done through contractors working outside factories as the Unions cannot influence them very much. As conditions of work offered by the latter are worse, even the members of the Union ultimately suffer.

There is some truth in the thesis propounded by the writer. But whatever may be the experience of the particular Union with which he was connected, he cannot generalise and say that all Trade Union leaders, simply because they depend upon the goodwill of the members for their election and maintenance, do not judge issues justly and independently. He is also right in suggesting that one of the most important functions of a Union is to level up the conditions in smaller places of employment to the level of the conditions in larger places so as to avoid the larger places which give better conditions being gradually wiped out. But as we cannot immediately build up a 100 per cent. Union at a stroke, the policy of keeping the larger employers up to the mark and levelling up the smaller ones must be simultaneously but judiciously pushed on.

The book deals with the affairs of one Union and gives the experience of one of its officials. Although in the book there is a good deal of material for thought to those who are connected with the administration of Trade Unions, the reader has to exercise caution in accepting statements and arguments, as they proceed from a man who is only dealing with his limited experience and is not quite free from personal bias. The book cannot on account of its very nature be of much interest to the general reader.

N. M. JOSHI.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- KING EDWARD VII: A BIOGRAPHY.** By SIR SIDNEY LEE. Vol. II. (MacMillan and Co., London.) 1927. 9 × 6. pp. 769. £1-11 s.
- CONTRACEPTION: Its Theory History and Practice.** By Dr. MARIE CARMICHAEL STOPES. (John Bale Sons & Danielson, Ltd., London.) 1927. 8½ × 5½. pp. 480. 15s.
- COMPULSORY SICKNESS INSURANCE.** (Comparative Analysis of National Laws and Statistics.) 1927. 9½ × 6½. pp. 794. 12s.
- PULMONARY TUBERCULOSIS: Its Etiology and Treatment.** By DAVID C. MUTHU. (Bailliere, Tindall and Cox, London.) 1927. 8½ × 5½. pp. 381. 12s. 6d.
- TWENTIETH CENTURY ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES.** By W. A. J. ARCHBOLD. (Longmans Green & Co., London.) 1927. 7½ × 5. pp. 270. 3s. 6d.
- VILLAGE UPLIFT IN INDIA.** By F. L. BRAYNE. (The Rural Community Council, Gurgaon.) 1927. 7½ × 5. pp. 211 Rs. 2.
- INTERNATIONAL CIVICS, THE COMMUNITY OF NATIONS.** By PITMAN B. POTTER AND ROSCOE L. WEST. (The Macmillan Company, New York.) 1927. 7½ × 5. pp. 315. 7s.